Case 5:03-cv-05642-JF Document 262 Filed 07/12/07 Page 1 of 6 **E-filed 7/12/07** TERRY T. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 121569 1 STEVEN D. GUGGENHEIM, State Bar No. 201386 KRISTIN A. DILLEHAY, State Bar No. 187257 2 CAMERON P. HOFFMAN, State Bar No. 229316 3 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI **Professional Corporation** 650 Page Mill Road 4 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050 Telephone: (650) 493-9300 5 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100 Email: kdillehay@wsgr.com 6 7 Attorneys for the Redback Defendants 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SAN JOSE DIVISION IN RE: CASE NO.: C-03-5642 JF (HRL) 12 REDBACK NETWORKS, INC. SECURITIES STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] 13 **ORDER REGARDING PAGE** LITIGATION. **LIMITS** 14 15 This Document Relates to: 16 ALL ACTIONS. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 C:\NrPortbl\PALIB1\MSTI\3150512_1.DOC STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER RE PAGE LIMITS; CASE NO. C-03-5642 JF (HRL)

STIPULATION

WHEREAS, on March 30, 2007, the Court entered an Order dismissing plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Consolidated Complaint and granting plaintiffs leave to amend as to the Redback Defendants (the "Order");

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Order, plaintiffs' Fifth Amended Consolidated Complaint for Violation of the Federal Securities Laws (the "Complaint") was filed on June 1, 2007;

WHEREAS, on June 25, 2007 the Court entered an Order pursuant to which the Redback Defendants' motion to dismiss the Complaint is due to be filed on July 13, 2007, plaintiffs' opposition to any motion to dismiss the Complaint is due to be filed on August 22, 2007, and the Redback Defendants' reply in further support of their motion to dismiss the Complaint is due to be filed on September 5, 2007;

WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-2(b) provides for a twenty-five (25) page limit on any motion and supporting memorandum of points and authorities filed in this action;

WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-3(a) provides for a twenty-five (25) page limit on any opposition to any motion filed in this action;

WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-3(c) provides for a fifteen (15) page limit on any reply memorandum of points and authorities in further support of any motion filed in this action;

WHEREAS, in order to promote the interests of judicial efficiency, defendants Kevin DeNuccio, Pierre Lamond, Thomas Cronan, Vinod Khosla, Dennis Wolf, Vivek Ragavan, Dennis Barsema, Gaurav Garg, William Kurtz, Craig Gentner, Promod Haque and Randall Kruep (collectively, the "Redback Defendants") intend to file a joint motion to dismiss the Complaint;

WHEREAS, given the complexity of the Complaint, as well as the complexity of the law governing the allegations in the Complaint, and given that each of the Redback Defendants would be entitled to file a separate, twenty-five (25) page motion to dismiss and supporting memorandum of points and authorities, and a separate fifteen (15) page reply memorandum of points and authorities pursuant to the Local Rules, the Redback Defendants believe it is appropriate to permit them to file a joint motion and supporting memoranda of points and

authorities in excess of the twenty-five (25) and fifteen (15) page limits provided by the Local 1 2 Rules; 3 WHEREAS, the Redback Defendants believe that they will need no more than thirty (30) pages for their memorandum of points and authorities in support of their joint motion to dismiss, 4 5 and no more than twenty (20) pages for their reply memorandum of points and authorities in further support of their motion to dismiss; and 6 7 WHEREAS, plaintiffs are not opposed to the page limits proposed by the Redback Defendants. 8 9 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the undersigned, 10 subject to approval of the Court, that: 11 1. The Redback Defendants' memorandum of points and authorities in support of 12 their joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five (25) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), but may not exceed a total of thirty (30) pages, exclusive of the 13 14 caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits. 2. 15 Plaintiffs' opposition to the Redback Defendants' joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(a), but may 16 not exceed a total of thirty (30) pages, exclusive of caption page, table of contents, table of 17 authorities, declarations and exhibits. 18 3. The Redback Defendants' reply memorandum of points and authorities in further 19 20 support of their joint motion to dismiss the operative complaint may exceed the fifteen (15) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(c), but may not exceed a total of twenty (20) pages, 21 22 exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits. 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 ///

Case 5:03-cv-05642-JF Document 262 Filed 07/12/07 Page 4 of 6

1	Dated: July 11, 2007	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI Professional Corporation
2		Troicessional Corporation
3		By: <u>/s/ Kristin A. Dillehay</u> Terry T. Johnson
4		Steven D. Guggenheim Kristin A. Dillehay
5		Cameron P. Hoffman
6		Attorneys for the Redback Defendants
7		
8	Dated: July 11, 2007	GRANT & EISENHOFER P.A.
9		By: /s/ John C. Kairis
10		Stuart M. Grant (pro hac vice) John C. Kairis (pro hac vice)
11		Kimberly L. Wierzel (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Chase Manhattan Centre
12		1201 North Market Street Wilmington, DE 19801
13		Tel: 302.622.7000 Fax: 302.622.7100
14		sgrant@gelaw.com
15		Merrill Glen Emerick (State Bar No. 117248) Anderlini, Finkelstein, Emerick & Smoot
16 17		400 S. El Camino Real, Suite 700 San Mateo, CA 94402
18		Attorneys for Lead Plaintiff The Connecticut Retirement Plan and Trust
19		Funds
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Upon stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing:

- 1. The Redback Defendants' memorandum of points and authorities in support of their joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five (25) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), but may not exceed a total of thirty (30) pages, exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.
- 2. Plaintiffs' opposition to the Redback Defendants' joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five (25) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(a), but may not exceed a total of thirty (30) pages, exclusive of caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.
- 3. The Redback Defendants' reply memorandum of points and authorities in further support of their joint motion to dismiss the operative complaint may exceed the fifteen (15) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(c), but may not exceed a total of twenty (20) pages, exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/12/07

THE HONORALLE JEREMY FOGEL United States District Judge

Case 5:03-cv-05642-JF Document 262 Filed 07/12/07 Page 6 of 6

1	I, Kristin A. Dillehay, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being	
2	used to file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Page Limits. In compliance with	
3	General Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that John Kairis has concurred in this filing.	
4	Dated: July 11, 2007 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI Professional Corporation	
5	Frotessional Corporation	
6	By: <u>/s/ Kristin A. Dillehay</u> Kristin A. Dillehay	
7	Attorneys for the Redback Defendants	
8	Attorneys for the Redoack Defendants	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		